



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/764,224	01/22/2004	Melvin Lee Jacobson	J274.12-0001	9161

164 7590 03/21/2006

KINNEY & LANGE, P.A.  
THE KINNEY & LANGE BUILDING  
312 SOUTH THIRD STREET  
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55415-1002

EXAMINER
----------

ROWAN, KURT C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3643

DATE MAILED: 03/21/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/764,224

Applicant(s)

JACOBSON, MELVIN LEE

Examiner

Kurt Rowan

Art Unit

3643

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on January 4, 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 5-10 and 12-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 5-10 and 12-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 04 January 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |                                                                                         |                                                                             |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                        | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)    | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                                |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____                                                             | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on January 4, 2006 has been entered.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 5, 6, 7, 12, 16-17, 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marsh et al. 2002/0112395 A1.

The Patent Application Publication '395 to Marsh shows an insect removal device 2 having an engagement surface (not labeled) covered with an adhesive layer 4, a backing side (not labeled) positioned opposite the engagement side, and a single release tab 6 covered with a tab liner 10 as shown in Fig. 1. The tab extends from the top edge of the main body. Marsh shows the device for removal of a pest from a

surface of a body of an animal or human. The main body is configured to conform to and attach to the surface to cover and smother the pest. Marsh shows the adhesive layer is composed of a material that is not irritating to human skin or animal skin. Marsh shows means such as the adhesive covered substrate for causing the pest to release from the surface since as shown in Fig. 4, the pest will be smothered by the adhesive which will cause the pest to release from the surrounding surface of a body. Marsh does not disclose that the pest removal device is placed on the skin of a body, but shows the device covering the pest at a point above the skin of a body. However, it would have been obvious that the device could be placed in contact with the skin of a body to obtain a more secure grasp of the pest by the adhesive. The release tab 6 of Marsh can be considered to be extending from an outer edge of the main body noting Fig. 1 since the tab does extend beyond the outer edge of the main body. In reference to claim 6, Marsh discloses that the adhesive layer is penetrated with an antiseptic in paragraph 16. In reference to claim 7, it would have been obvious to provide Marsh with alcohol which is an old and well known antiseptic. In reference to claim 12, Marsh shows a main body 2 having a length, a width, and an outer edge. Marsh shows the main body formed of a flexible resilient foam material as disclosed in page 1 paragraph numbered [0011]. Marsh shows an engagement side covered with an adhesive layer 4 and a backing side positioned opposite the engagement side. The main body is substantially flat and shows the structure capable of being attachable to the surface by the adhesive layer to cover and smother the pest. Marsh shows a release tab 6 extending from (beyond) an outer edge as shown in Fig. 1. Marsh shows

the release tab is graspable to apply a pulling force as shown in Fig. 4 to the center and hence to the outer edge of the main body to peel the main body off the surface. Marsh shows the release tab having a length parallel to the main body length in Fig. 1. Marsh does not disclose that the tab has a length less than the main body length and a width less than the main body width, but it would have been obvious to employ a tab with a length and width less than the main body width since the size of the tab would be determined through routine experimentation. See *In re Dailey et al.*, 147 USPQ 47. Marsh does not disclose the use of a hypoallergenic pressure sensitive adhesive, but states that the adhesive would be well known to one skilled in the art as stated on page 1 in paragraph numbered [0011]. Hence it would have been obvious to employ a hypoallergenic pressure sensitive adhesive.

3. Claims 10 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marsh et al. '395 as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Grueling. The patent to Marsh shows a pest removal device as discussed above. The patent to Grueling shows a pest removal device for removing a pest from a surface having a main body with an engagement side 7, 8 covered with an adhesive layer 13, 14 as shown in Fig. 5. Grueling shows a backing side positioned opposite the engagement side and wherein the main body is configured to be applied to the surface to cover and smother the pest. Grueling shows a single release tab 11, 12 extending from an outer edge of the main body and covered with an adhesive layer 15, 16. In reference to claims 10 and 15, Grueling discloses an adhesive 4 on both sides of the main body 1 as shown in Fig. 2a.

6. Claims 8, 9, 13-14, 18-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marsh as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Nelson '862

The patents to Marsh and Nelson show insect capturing devices. Marsh has been discussed above and does not show the liner spooled in a dispenser. In reference to claims 8, 18, and 20, the patent to Nelson shows an insect capturing device with storing liner 50 as shown in Fig. 16. It would have been obvious to provide the pest capturing device of Marsh with a storage liner as shown by Nelson for the purpose of holding a plurality of capturing devices together during transport. In reference to claims 9 and 21, it would have been obvious to provide the insect capturing device of Marsh with a storing liner spooled on a dispenser shown in Fig. 9a of Nelson to conveniently carry more than one insect catcher at a time. In reference to claim 13, Nelson shows in Figs. 12-14 the main body having a length and width that are equal and define the diameter of a circle. In reference to claim 14, Nelson does not show a release tab in the shape of a half circle that extends from the perimeter of the main body. Nelson shows the main body having a smaller area of adhesive and the edge of the main body acts as a tab in both the rectangular and circular embodiments. Marsh does not disclose the shape of the tab. However, it would have been obvious to employ a semi-circular tab or a half circular tab since changes in shape are obvious noting that the function is the same. See *In re Dailey et al.*, 149 USPQ 47. In reference to claim 22, it would have second layer of adhesive 4 covering the second side of the substrate 1 in Fig. 2a.

4. Claims 24-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over of Marsh in view Nelson.

5. The patents to Marsh and Nelson show insect capturing devices and have been discussed above. Marsh shows a material (as disclosed in paragraph 0016) incorporated into the adhesive to cause the pest to release from the surface. In reference to claim 24, it would have been obvious to provide the insect capturing device of Marsh and a storing liner as shown by Nelson in Fig. 16 to store a plurality of capture devices. Nelson shows a generally circular disk. The pest removal device of Nelson as shown in Fig. 5 contacts the body surface surrounding the pest and the pest removal device is substantially flat and flush with the body surface when in use to remove a pest. Also, column 6, lines 13-20. The patent to Marsh shows an insect removal device as discussed above. Marsh shows providing a pest removal device (as described above in reference to claim 23), positioning the engagement side completely over the pest (as shown by Marsh in Fig. 3), securing the pest removal device to the pest, pulling the single release tab, and removing the pest removal device with the pest attached to the engagement side of the pest removal device (as shown in Fig. 4). Marsh does not disclose attaching the pest removal device to the skin or the surface. The patent to Nelson shows attaching the pest removal device to the surface and the pest as shown in Fig. 5. In reference to claim 25, it would have been obvious to provide Marsh with the step of attaching the pest removal device to the pest and the surface as shown by Nelson for a time sufficient to cause the pest to release from the surface. Since Marsh discloses an antiseptic, which will kill the pest in time, it appears that the pest would try

to escape the antiseptic by releasing from the surface. In reference to claim 26, Nelson shows a storage liner 110. In reference to claim 27, both Nelson and Marsh show folding the pest removal device to trap the pest. Nelson shows folding the pest removal device after peeling the device from the body surface to trap the pest as shown in Fig. 5 and Fig. 6. In reference to claim 28, Nelson discloses disposing of the pest removal device in column 7, lines 32-33. In reference to claim 29, neither Marsh or Nelson disclose saving the pest attached to the pest removal device and analyzing the pest for disease, but it would have been obvious to study the pest for disease to determine if more medical treatment is required.

### ***Response to Arguments***

6. Applicant's arguments filed January 4, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The claims have been given broadest reasonable interpretation noting the use of several "means plus function" clauses in the claims. If applicant invokes 35 USC 112, sixth paragraph, the examiner will apply a different criteria in addressing the limitations rendered by the means plus function clauses. Applicant's response overcomes the objections to the drawings by the addition of Fig. 4A.

Applicant argues that the present invention contacts the body so that the device completely surrounds the pest in order that an antiseptic solution will irritate or suffocate the pest. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention such as stated above, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., the antiseptic solution) are not recited in rejected claim 23.



Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). In response to applicant's argument that Marsh and the present invention function in different manners as a result of different structure, a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. The claimed structure is the same as that shown by Marsh. Hence Marsh can perform the intended use in the manner recited by the present claims. In regard to claim 24, applicant is relying on a section of Nelson that deals with the removal of an insect from a surface. Applicant is referred to column 6, lines 13-20 which discuss how Nelson specifically deals with the removal of an insect from the skin of a person.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kurt Rowan whose telephone number is (571) 272-6893. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 6:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Peter Poon can be reached on (571) 272-6891. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3643

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Kurt Rowan", with a stylized flourish at the end.

Kurt Rowan  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 3643

KR